US ERA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

eri,		Shaughnessy No: 103301	
		Date Out of EAB: 6/23/88	
To:	John Tic Product Registra	Manager #16	
From:	Special	P. Firestone, Chief McChaul , Justone Review Section #2 Assessment Branch/HED (TS-769C)	
Thru:	Paul F. Exposure	Schuda, Chief Assessment Branch/HED (TS-769C)	۷
Attached	d, please	e find the EAB review of:	
Reg./Fi	le # :	223,409	
Chemical	l Name :	Acephate	
Type Pro	oduct :	Insecticide	
Product	Name :	C chene	
Company	Name :		
Purpose	:	Exposure Study	
	·		
Date Rec	eived:	6/8/88 Action Code: 350	
Date Com	pleted:	6/23/88 EAB #(s): 80812	
Monitori	ng study	requested: X Total Reviewing Time: 10 days	
		volunteered:	
Deferral	s to:	Ecological Effects Branch	
		Residue Chemistry Branch	
	*	Toxicology Branch	

Г	Menso		Promation – Does	•	· ·	urity Informa	ORD tion (E.O. 12	065) 6/8	1/88	
l	. 2. IDENTIFYING NUMBER	3. ACTION CODE			4 ACCESS	ON NO.		466	37 _H	
1	onespadence	350			4. ACCESSION NUMBER			TO BE COMPLETED BY 5. RECORD NUMBER		
	Antul# 16-742							2234	119	
	101/2				÷		6. RE	FERENCE NU	JMBER	
L					*		7. DA	TE RECEIVE	D (EPA)	
<u>-</u>								V/3/	125	
	•		,			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		ATUYORY DU		
-							9. PRO	DUCT MANA	GER (PM)	
14	4 CHECK IS ASS						10. PM	TEAM NUME	<u>/ /7; //</u> BER	
•	4. CHECK IF APPLICABLE	•			0			16		
	Public Health/Quarantine	. [☐ Minor Use		Espech	Q / A	11. DA	BE COMPLETE SENT TO	TED BY PO	
	Substitute Chemical	Г	Part of IPM	(reg	west to			2-1	DED/TSS	
	Seasonal Concern			1	folian		12. PRI	ORITY NUM	BER	
5.	. INSTRUCTIONS TO REVIEWER	L	Review Requi	res Less Tha	n 4 Hours		13. PRO	JECTED RET	URN DAT	
	A. HED Total Assessment - 3(c)(5)	_		F. INST	RUCTIONS			6/30/8	8	
	Incremental Risk Assessme		. D BFSD	Ka	gent	neele	l da	TOX	R.	
	memo of May 12, 1977.	on F	Other	eval	luston		Mr.	A	11	
	B. SPRD (Send Copy of Form to SPRD) Chemical Undergoing Active RPAR Position	PM)					Some	Bruse.	elfor	
	- Orientical Undergoing Assis			1 72	. 0	· #			A //	
	Vit HavisM			The	128	renced.	studio	The we	l de	
	Chemical Unders		· ·	men	mily so	~~ ~	A.B. o	The west	!	
i, i	Chemical Undergoing Activ Registration Standards Rev			men	011	~~ ~	AB. n	most (tho	
i. i	Chemical Undergoing Active Registration Standards Review		Carrie	meni copple	011	~~ ~	AB, n	rest (tho	
	Chemical Undergoing Active Registration Standards Review		Commend 188	chal	011	~~ ~	AB. no storke	rest (- rest (-) have lef, 7	the steer	
. 3 [Chemical Undergoing Active Registration Standards Revision Standards R	Any 5/25	188	CAN 18. REVIE	cata es	mese exerta	AB. n state tin in	rest (- not (- n	the steer	
3	Chemical Undergoing Active Registration Standards Review attacks (c) (1) (D) Use Any or All Available Information Use Only the Attached Data for Formula Available Information on the Technical of	Any 5/25	188	L	color es the per	exerta.		rest (- net (-) have Ref. 7	the See	
3	Chemical Undergoing Active Registration Standards Review attacks (c) (1) (D) Use Any or All Available Information Use Only the Attached Data for Formula Available Information on the Technical of	My Use Only ation and Anor Manufactu	Attached Data y or All iring Chemical	CAAL 18. REVIE	Edda 4 EWS SENT TO	mesee exercise from ser		rest (- rest (the See	
3	Chemical Undergoing Active Registration Standards Review attacks RELATED ACTIONS attacks (c) (1) (D) Use Any or All Available Information Use Only the Attached Data for Formula Available Information on the Technical Control of Type Of Review	Any 5/25	Attached Data y or All iring Chemical	LITB	Edda 4 EWS SENT TO	exerta.		СН	☐ BFS	
3	Chemical Undergoing Active Registration Standards Review attacked B(c)(1)(D) Use Any or All Available Information Use Only the Attached Data for Formula Available Information on the Technical of Type OF REVIEW TOXICOLOGY	Use Only ation and Antor Manufactu	Attached Data y or All ring Chemical.	☐ RC	the Jew EWS SENT TO BENUMBER	exerciant EEB EFB OF ACTIONS			☐ BFS	
3	Chemical Undergoing Active Registration Standards Review attacks RELATED ACTIONS attacks (c) (1) (D) Use Any or All Available Information Use Only the Attached Data for Formula Available Information on the Technical Control of Type Of Review	My Use Only ation and Anor Manufactu	Attached Data y or All ring Chemical.	☐ RC	the Jew EWS SENT TO BENUMBER	exerciant EEB EFB OF ACTIONS		СН	☐ BFS	
3 [Chemical Undergoing Active Registration Standards Review attacked B(c)(1)(D) Use Any or All Available Information Use Only the Attached Data for Formula Available Information on the Technical of Type OF REVIEW TOXICOLOGY	Use Only ation and Antor Manufactu	Attached Data y or All ring Chemical.	☐ RC	the Jew EWS SENT TO BENUMBER	exerciant EEB EFB OF ACTIONS		СН	☐ BFS	
3 [Chemical Undergoing Active Registration Standards Review attacks RELATED ACTIONS attacked B(c)(1)(D) Use Any or All Available Information Use Only the Attached Data for Formula Available Information on the Technical of TYPE OF REVIEW TOXICOLOGY ECOLOGICAL EFFECTS RESIDUE CHEMISTRY	Use Only ation and Antor Manufactu	Attached Data y or All ring Chemical.	☐ RC	the Jew EWS SENT TO BENUMBER	exerciant EEB EFB OF ACTIONS		СН		
3 [Chemical Undergoing Active Registration Standards Review attacked RELATED ACTIONS Included attacked attacked attacked attacked attacked attacked Data for Formula Available Information on the Technical of Type OF REVIEW TOXICOLOGY ECOLOGICAL EFFECTS RESIDUE CHEMISTRY ENVIRONMENTAL DATE	Use Only ation and Antor Manufactu	Attached Data y or All ring Chemical.	☐ RC	the Jew EWS SENT TO BENUMBER	exerciant EEB EFB OF ACTIONS		СН	☐ BFS	
3 [Chemical Undergoing Active Registration Standards Review attacks RELATED ACTIONS attacked B(c)(1)(D) Use Any or All Available Information Use Only the Attached Data for Formula Available Information on the Technical of TYPE OF REVIEW TOXICOLOGY ECOLOGICAL EFFECTS RESIDUE CHEMISTRY	Use Only ation and Antor Manufactu	Attached Data y or All ring Chemical.	☐ RC	the Jew EWS SENT TO BENUMBER	exerciant EEB EFB OF ACTIONS		СН	☐ BFS	
3 [Chemical Undergoing Active Registration Standards Review attacked RELATED ACTIONS Included attacked attacked attacked attacked attacked attacked Data for Formula Available Information on the Technical of Type OF REVIEW TOXICOLOGY ECOLOGICAL EFFECTS RESIDUE CHEMISTRY ENVIRONMENTAL DATE	Use Only ation and Antor Manufactu	Attached Data y or All ring Chemical.	☐ RC	the Jew EWS SENT TO BENUMBER	exerciant EEB EFB OF ACTIONS		СН	☐ BFS	
3 [[Chemical Undergoing Active Registration Standards Review authorized authorized authorized authorized authorized authorized authorized (authorized authorized (authorized (auth	Use Only ation and Antor Manufactu	Attached Data y or All ring Chemical.	☐ RC	the Jew EWS SENT TO BENUMBER	exerciant EEB EFB OF ACTIONS		СН	☐ BFS	
3 [[0	Chemical Undergoing Active Registration Standards Review autuals RELATED ACTIONS Surfued autuals (C)(1)(D) Use Any or All Available Information Use Only the Attached Data for Formula Available Information on the Technical of Type OF REVIEW TOXICOLOGY ECOLOGICAL EFFECTS RESIDUE CHEMISTRY ENVIRONMENTAL DATE CHEMISTRY EFFICACY	Use Only ation and Antor Manufactu	Attached Data y or All ring Chemical.	☐ RC	the Jew EWS SENT TO BENUMBER	exerciant EEB EFB OF ACTIONS		СН	☐ BFS	
3 [[]	Chemical Undergoing Active Registration Standards Review authorized authorized authorized authorized authorized authorized authorized (authorized authorized (authorized (auth	Use Only ation and Antor Manufactu	Attached Data y or All ring Chemical.	☐ RC	the Jew EWS SENT TO BENUMBER	DEEB OF ACTIONS Sec. 18		СН	☐ BFS	
3 [[]	Chemical Undergoing Active Registration Standards Review Authorities authoriti	Use Only ation and Anor Manufactu	Attached Data y or All rring Chemical. On Petition	EUP	Muly received to the service of the	LEEB FB OF ACTIONS Sec. 18		СН	☐ BFS	
3 []	Chemical Undergoing Active Registration Standards Review RELATED ACTIONS Autuals B(c)(1)(D) Use Any or All Available Information Use Only the Attached Data for Formula Available Information on the Technical of Type OF REVIEW TOXICOLOGY ECOLOGICAL EFFECTS RESIDUE CHEMISTRY ENVIRONMENTAL DATE CHEMISTRY EFFICACY PRECAUTIONARY LABELING ECONOMIC ANALYSIS	Use Only ation and Anor Manufactu	Attached Data y or All ring Chemical.	EUP	EWS SENT TO	LEEB FB OF ACTIONS Sec. 18	Inert	СН	Other	

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Guidance for the Reregistration of Pesticide Products Containing Acephate as the Active Ingredient document issued in September 1987 required the submission of nondietary exposure data for indoor residential and commercial indoor uses of acephate, outdoor home and commercial uses, greenhouse uses, and tobacco uses. These uses were selected due to lack of sufficient exposure data to permit the Agency to estimate the exposure to acephate. The required studies have been submitted by Chevron and have been evaluated by the Exposure Assessment Branch (EAB). In addition, the Benefits and Use Division (BUD) has provided EAB with the use information necessary to conduct the exposure assessment (Transmittal of Exposure Parameters for Various Acephate Use Sites, Memorandum from Yuen-Shaung Ng,

This exposure assessment has been expedited as per the request of the Registration Division Director (E. Tinsworth memorandum to A. Barton, HED Director dated May 10, 1988).

2.0 EXPOSURE TO HOMEOWNERS DURING OUTDOOR USE OF ACEPHATE

Chevron submitted an exposure study entitled "Potential Exposure to Acephate During Home Use of Orthene Systemic Insect Control" which was evaluated by EAB (Lunchick, C., EAB #80536, May 16, 1988). The inhalation exposure was below detection limits which would have provided an exposure of 0.15 mg/lb ai or 0.03% of the dermal exposure. Dermal exposure for homeowners applying acephate to ornamentals by hose-end sprayer were 480 mg/lb ai to 450 mg/lb ai depending on the clothing worn. Clothing scenarios varied as to shorts or long pants and long- or short-sleeved shirts. Hand exposure accounted for over 90% of the dermal exposure and should homeowners properly wear protective gloves, as required by the registration standard, the exposure would be reduced approximately five-fold. The Orthene used at the time of the study did not require protective gloves, and the exposure assessment will reflect that use.

BUD estimated that a homeowner would treat 600 square feet a day and may spray 15 times during the year to treat 9000 square feet. The total time required to fill the hose-end sprayer with acephate and treat 600 square feet is 41 min/day. A total of 0.42 fl oz ai are required to treat 600 square feet and 6.35 fl oz ai are required to treat 9000 square feet. Assuming one gallon weighs eight pounds, the weight of active ingredient in 0.42 fl oz and 6.35 fl oz is 0.026 lbs and 0.40 lbs ai, respectively. The daily exposure to a 70 kg homeowner using a hose-end sprayer to apply acephate is (450 mg/lb ai x 0.026 lb ai/day x 1/70 kg) 0.17 mg/kg/day and (450 mg/lb ai x 0.40 lb ai/yr x 1/70 kg) 2.6 mg/kg/yr.

3.0 EXPOSURE TO MIXER/LOADER/APPLICATORS DURING GREENHOUSE USE OF ACEPHATE

A surrogate study in which Sumagic PGR was applied by pressure hand-held sprayer to greenhouse ornamentals was submitted by Individuals wearing long pants and long-sleeved shirts but not protective gloves were determined by EAB (Lunchick, C., EAB #80537, May 26, 1988) to receive a dermal exposure of 160 mg/lb ai during mixing/loading and application. Airborne levels of Sumagic were below the detection limit and, therefore, inhalation exposure would be insignificant. The reregistration guidance document requires acephate labels to be revised to require the use of protective gloves during use. ai estimate would overestimate exposure for individuals complying with the revised labeling. EAB cannot quantify the reduction in dermal exposure from the use of gloves because many of the dosimeters were below the detection limit and, therefore, a substantial portion of the 160 mg/lb ai exposure estimate is based on 50% of the detection limit.

The BUD use information assumed a 40 ft x 500 ft greenhouse with 14,000 square feet of benches. It was assumed that acephate would be applied at 10.5 oz Orthene 75S/100 gallons water (0.49 to runoff.

Based on these assumptions, a total of 2.76 oz or 0.17 lb ai are used daily. Yearly use assumed acephate is applied weekly over a 42-week period requiring 115.76 oz ai or 7.2 lb ai. It is unlikely that acephate would be the sole insecticide used weekly due to the fear of resistance among the insect population. The daily exposure to a 70 kg individual mixing/loading and applying acephate in a greenhouse is estimated to be (160 mg/lb ai x 0.17 lb ai/day x 1/70 kg) 0.34 mg/kg/day. The annual exposure tot he mg/kg/yr.

Postapplication monitoring of Sumagic showed nondetectable airborne levels at 4 hours and 1, 2, and 4 days postapplication. The relationship of 'vapor pressures between Sumagic and acephate would partially determine if the Sumagic observations are indicative of postapplication airborne levels of acephate. Ventilation rates in the greenhouse also are important in affecting the airborne concentration of a pesticide after application. The air exchange in the Sumagic study greenhouse was 16,000 cfm.

4.0 EXPOSURE FROM PCO'S TREATMENT OF RESIDENTIAL SITES

EAB evaluated the PCO exposure study submitted by Chevron in response to the reregistration guidance document and estimated that the dermal exposure to a PCO treating a residential site was 160 mg/lb ai (Lunchick, C., EAB #80477, May 5, 1988). The estimate is for a PCO mixing/loading and applying acephate by hand-held sprayer to baseboards and cabinets. The estimate is based on a PCO wearing long pants, long-sleeved shirts, and no protective gloves. Gloves were not worn during the exposure 91%) of the dermal exposure. The reregistration guidance document requires the acephate labels to be revised to include the use of protective gloves. Assuming that properly worn gloves would reduce dermal exposure by 90%, the use of the fold.

The use estimates provided by BUD assume that 252 feet are sprayed in a house and 228 feet are sprayed in an apartment. Using a spray dilution of 1.0 oz/gal water, a total of 0.18 oz ai are used per home and 0.12 oz ai are used per apartment. Based on 16 homes or 24 apartments treated daily with acephate, the PCO would handle 2.88 oz ai or 0.18 1b ai daily. Maximum yearly use estimates assume the PCO sprays 220 days/year using only PCO uses 633.6 oz ai or 39.6 1b ai/yr is a maximal overestimate of usage. Based on these use estimates, the exposure to a 70 kg PCO treating residential units is 0.41 mg/kg/day and 91 mg/kg/yr.

Inhalation exposure for all residential PCOs was below the detection limit. All postapplication air samples (4 hrs, 1, 2, and 4 days) were below the detection limit. Based on the detection limit of 2.0 ug and 240 l drawn through the sampling tube during the 4-hour sampling period, the air levels did not exceed 0.008 ug/l. Assuming a 70 kg resident spends 24 hours in a treated room of which 18 hours is at rest and 6 hours is at light work, the inhalation exposure for this resident would not exceed [(18 hrs x 60 min/hr x 7.4 l/min + 6 hrs x 60 min/hr x 29 l/min) x 0.008 ug/l x 1/70 kgl 2.1 ug/kg/day.

5.0 EXPOSURE FROM PCO TREATMENT OF COMMERCIAL SITES

The dermal exposure to PCOs treating commercial sites was similar to residential site exposure and was 170 mg/lb ai (Lunchick, C., EAB #80477, May 5, 1988). The dermal exposure estimate assumed the PCO wore long pants, long-sleeved shirt, and no protective gloves. As was observed with residential site treatments, the hands accounted for the majority of the dermal exposure (77 to 99%, average = 94%). The proper use of protective gloves by PCOs

would reduce dermal exposure about 80% or five-fold, assuming that the gloves reduce hand exposure 90%. The reregistration guidance document requires acephate labels to be revised to include the use of protective gloves. Inhalation exposure was below detectable levels for eight of the nine commercial PCOs. The inhalation exposure to the PCO was calculated to be 2.8 mg/lb ai.

BUD estimated that PCOs will treat commercial sites at 0.10 oz /gallon spray by hand-held sprayer. Treating a commercial kitchen site of 2479 ft in a hotel would require 0.12 oz ai. Treating 45 guest rooms would require 0.54 oz ai and treating the hotel's dining room would require 0.22 oz ai. One hotel could be hotel in a day and would require 0.88 oz ai or 0.055 lb ai/day. Exposure would be 0.13 mg/kg/day (170 mg/lb ai x 0.055 lb ai/day. 1/70 kg). Inhalation exposure generally would not exceed did not provide annual use estimates; however, if one uses the annual exposures to the PCO are 29 mg/kg/yr for dermal exposure residential uses, it is extremely unlikely that a PCO will actually treat 220 days/yr with acephate.

The postapplication air concentration of acephate at the commercial sites did not exceed 0.015 ug/l which occurred at 4 hours postapplication. Assuming a worker is exposed 8 hours per day and has a respiratory volume of 29 1/min, the daily exposure would not exceed (29 1/min x 60 min/hr x 8 hr/day x 1/70 x 0.015 with acephate, the annual respiratory exposure wold be 150 ug/kg/yr for workers at the commercial site.

6.0 EXPOSURE TO MIXER/LOADER/APPLICATORS DURING FOLIAR GROUND BOOM APPLICATION TO TOBACCO

EAB shall use surrogate data to estimate the exposure to mixer/loaders and applicators applying Orthene Tobacco Insect Spray to tobacco by ground boom. Chevron submitted a surrogate exposure study in which captofol was applied to wheat. The study was rejected by EAB (Nelson, H., EAB# 80535, June 17, 1988) due to inconsistencies and ambiguities in reported amounts of captafol handled during the sampling period. EAB will use its surrogate data in place of the captafol study.

Everhart, L.P. and Holt, R.F. (Potential Benlate Fungicide Exposure During Mixer/Loader Operations, Crop Harvest, and Home Use, J. Agric. Food Chem., 30:222-227) measured the exposure to mixer/loaders handling Benlate, a wettable powder containing 50 percent benomyl. Orthene Tobacco Insect Spray is a 75 percent ai

soluble powder. Dermal exposure was measured using surgical gauze pads and cotton undertaker's gloves for the hands. The exposure was as follows and is adjusted to include the use of long-sleeved shirts and protective gloves:

Exposure (mg)*								
	Repl.							
Body Area	11	2	5	6	7	8	9	10
Forearms	0.075	0.58	1.6	3.8	0.19	0.73	0.42	1.4
Face	0.026	0.29	2.9	7.8	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.1
Back of								
Neck	0.004	0.017	0.11	0.035	0.004	0.42	0.23	0.14
Back	0.014	0.053	0.36	0.11	0.014	1.3	0.75	0.46
Front of								
Neck	0.006	0.033	0.57	0.71	0.051	0.12	0.51	0.23
Chest	0.014	0.078	1.3	1.7	0.12	0.27	1.2	0.53
Hands	0.32	0.37	1.1	1.0	0.23	1.7	0.47	4.5
	0.459	1.42	7.94	15.2	2.01	5.94	4.98	8.36
lb ai	18.5	18.5	20	23.5	12.5	20	30	3.0
Exposure mg/lb ai	0.025	0.077	0.40	0.64	0.16	0.30	0.17	0.28

^{*}Data from Tables I and III, body surface areas from Subdivision U, Exposure Assessment Guidelines.

The mean exposure for the eight replicates is 0.26~mg/lb ai. Mean respiratory exposure was 4.4~ug/lb ai.

To estimate the dermal exposure to ground boom applicators, EAB reviewed six studies available in the published literature. The estimated dermal exposure for ground boom applicators applying 1.0 lb ai/A while wearing the described clothing is presented below:

Study	Replicates	Exposure (mg/hr)	Clothing
Abbott	18	40	long-sleeved shirt, long pants
Maitlen	21	0.7	short-sleeved shirt, long pants
Dubelman	12 .	0.93	long-sleeved shirt long pants
Wojeck	23	72	long-sleeved shirt, long pants
Staiff	20	0.4	short-sleeved shirt, long pants
Wolfe	7	9.4	short-sleeved shirt, long pants

The total of 101 replicates yielded a weighted geometric mean exposure of 4.6 mg/hr. The large range of 0.4 to 72 mg/hr around this geometric mean reflects the wide range of exposure that can occur to applicators during ground boom application. Tractor-type and boom equipment can greatly affect exposure. Enclosed cabs provide a physical barrier between the applicator and spray. Wojeck found that shielding the boom yielded lower exposures. Wind can blow spray drift across the applicator and increase exposure. It is reasonable to assume that depending on equipment used, weather conditions, and the personal habits of the applicator, the exposure received during any given application can fall anywhere within this range of 0.4 and 72 mg/hr. Inhalation exposure during ground boom application is approximately 1 percent of the dermal exposure.

BUD estimated that foliar spraying to tobacco will occur at 0.33 to 1.0 lb ai/A. The average acreage of tobacco that is treated is 5 acres. Based on an average application rate of 0.5 lb ai/A and 5 acres/farm, a private grower will handle 2.5 lb ai/day and require 25 minutes/day to treat the 5 acres. Three applications are likely during the growing season which would require the handling of 7.5 lb ai/yr

and 75 minutes of actual spray time annually. Based on these use parameters, the exposure to a tobacco farmer applying acephate is as follows:

Daily dermal mixer/loader: 0.26 mg/lb ai x 2.5 lb ai/day x 1/70 kg = 0.0093 mg/kg/day

Daily dermal applicator: $4.6 \text{ mg/hr} \times 0.5 \times 0.42 \text{ hrs/day}$ $\times 1/70 \text{ kg} = 0.014 \text{ mg/kg/day}$

Combined daily dermal exposure: 0.0093 mg/kg/day + 0.014 mg/kg/day = 0.023 mg/kg/day

Daily respiratory M/L: 4.4 ug/lb ai x 2.5 lb ai/day x 1/70 kg = 0.16 ug/kg/day

Daily respiratory applicator: 0.014 mg/kg/day x 1% = 0.14 ug/kg/day

Combined daily respiratory: 0.16 ug/kg/day + 0.14 ug/kg/day = 0.30 ug/kg/day

Annual dermal M/L: 0.0093 mg/kg/day x 3 days/yr = 0.028 ug/kg/yr

Annual dermal applicator: 0.014 mg/kg/day x 3 days/yr = 0.042 mg/kg/yr

Combined annual dermal exposure: 0.028 mg/kg/yr + 0.042 mg/kg/yr = 0.070 mg/kg/yr

Annual respiratory M/L: 0.16 ug/kg/day x 3 days/yr = 0.48 ug/kg/yr

Annual respiratory applicator: 0.14 ug/kg/day x 3 days/yr = 0.42 ug/kg/yr

Combined annual respiratory: 0.48 ug/kg/yr + 0.42 ug/kg/yr = 0.90 ug/kg/yr

7.0 EXPOSURE TO MIXER/LOADER/APPLICATORS DURING TRANSPLANT TOBACCO GROUND BOOM APPLICATION

According to BUD, acephate is applied to transplant beds by ground boom application at an application rate of 1.0 lb ai/A. The exposure scenario is similar to that used in Section 6.0 and, therefore, the same surrogate data will be used. Because of the spacing of the transplant tobacco beds, the ground speed of the tractor is 1.5 mph, rather than the 5.0 mph likely with foliar spraying. Both scenarios are based on 5 acres of tobacco, but the slower tractor speed in the transplant beds and other changes

in application technique mean that the applicator will require 41 minutes to treat 5 acres at 1.0 lb ai/A, rather than the 25 minutes required to foliar treat 5 acres at 0.5 lb ai/A. EAB dependent on pounds active ingredient handled, rather than time. The transplant tobacco applicator will spray 5.0 lb ai during the 41 minutes while the foliar applicator sprayed 2.5 lbs ai during the 25 minutes. The daily exposure to the applicator will, based on the handling of twice the amount of acephate. One application to bedding plants is made during the growing season. The daily/annual exposure estimates are as follows:

Dermal M/L: 0.26 mg/lb ai x 5.0 lbs ai/day or year x 1/70 kg = 0.019 mg/kg/day or year

Dermal Applicator: 0.014 mg.kg based on 2.5 lbs ai x 2 = 0.028 mg/kg/day or year

Combined Dermal: 0.019 mg/kg/day or year + 0.028 mg/kg/day or year = 0.047 mg/kg/day or year

Respiratory M/L: 4.4 ug/lb ai x 5.0 lb ai/day or year x 1/70 kg = 0.31 ug/kg/day or year

Respiratory Applicator: 0.028 mg/kg/day or year x 1% = 0.28 ug/kg/day or year

Combined Respiratory: 0.31 ug/kg/day or year + 0.28 ug/kg/day or year = 0.59 ug/kg/day or year

8.0 EXPOSURE TO MIXER/LOADER/APPLICATORS DURING GROUND BOOM APPLICATION OF ACEPHATE TO TURF GRASS

EAB has evaluated exposure data submitted by Chevron in which Orthene 75S Soluble Powder was applied to golf courses by ground boom (Schlosser, A., EAB #80538, May 23, 1988). Orthene 75S is a soluble powder containing 75% acephate as the active ingredient. The exposure to individuals wearing long pants and long-sleeved shirts was as follows:

Dermal Mixer/Loader: 4.13 mg/lb ai Dermal Applicator: 0.34 mg/lb ai Combined Dermal: 4.48 mg/lb ai Inhalation Mixer/Loader: 2.8 ug/lb ai Inhalation Applicator: 2.1 ug/lb ai Combined Inhalation: 4.9 ug/lb ai

#

The dermal exposure estimates assumed that protective gloves are not worn. The reregistration guidance document requires acephate labels to be revised to include the use of protective gloves for mixer/loaders and applicators. Hand exposure in the Chevron study accounted for 98% of the mixer/loader dermal exposure and 68% of the applicator dermal exposure. Assuming that gloves reduce hand exposure 90%, proper use of protective gloves would reduce mixer/loader dermal exposure 88% and applicator dermal

Orthone 75S is applied to turf grass at 0.5 to 2.4 oz/1000 ft 2 by ground boom. Use information provided by BUD indicates that 6.5 acres/day on a golf course may be treated requiring 213.75 oz ai or 13 lbs ai/day. Golf course fairways average 48 acres and receive two insecticide applications annually; greens average 3.5 acres and require four applications annually, and tees average 2.5 acres and are treated once. The total acreage treated annually is, therefore, $[(48 \times 2) + (3.5 \times 4) + 2.5]$ 112.5 acres. Since 6 acres are treated daily, a total of 17 days are required annually to apply insecticides to golf course turf

Based on the above parameters, turf grass application exposure to acephate exposure is estimated as follows:

Dermal

T.C

Daily Exposure:

4.13 mg/lb ai x 13 lbs ai/day x 1/70 kg =0.77 mg/kg day

Applicator 0.34 mg/lb ai x 13 lbs ai/day x 1/70 kg = 0.063 mg/kg/day

Combined 0.77 mg/kg/day + 0.063 mg/kg/day =0.83 mg/kg/day

Annual Exposure:

 $\underline{M/L}$ 0.77 mg/kg/day x 17 days/yr = 13 mg/kg/yr

Applicator 0.063 mg/kg/day x 17 days/yr = 1.1 mg/kg/yr

Combined 0.83 mg/kg/day x 17 days/yr = 14 mg/kg/yr

Inhalation

Daily Exposure:

2.8 ug/lb ai x 13 lbs ai/day x 1/70 =0.52 ug/kg/yr

Applicator 2.1 ug/lb ai x 13 lb ai/day x 1/70 = 0.39 ug/kg/day

 $\frac{\text{Combined}}{\text{0.91 ug/kg/day}} = 0.52 \text{ mg/kg/day} + 0.39 \text{ ug/kg/day} = 0.91 \text{ ug/kg/day}$

Annual:

M/L 0.52 ug/kg/day x 17 days/yr = 8.8 ug/kg/yr

Applicator 0.39 ug/kg/day x 17 days/yr = 6.6 ug/kg/yr

Combined 0.91 ug/kg/day x 17 days/yr = 15 ug/kg/yr

9.0 CONCLUSIONS

Based on exposure data submitted by Chevron and surrogate data reviewed by the EAB, nondietary exposure to acephate has been calculated. The annual exposure estimates assumes that all insecticide applications are with acephate. Because of resistance concerns and market penetration of acephate, it is unlikely that PCOs, farmers, and turf grass applicators will rely solely on acephate and, therefore, the annual estimates should be considered maximal. The exposure estimates, with the exception of tobacco, assume the use of long-sleeved shirts and long pants, but no protective gloves. Current acephate labels do not require the gloves. The proper use of protective gloves, as required by the reregistration guidance document, will greatly reduce dermal exposure. Based on the evaluated data which indicated that approximately 65 to 99% of the dermal exposure occurred to the hands, the gloves would reduce the exposure estimates two- to ten-fold. This exposure reduction estimates assume the proper use of protective gloves reduces hand exposure 90%.

EAB estimates that the daily and annual exposures to acephate are as follows:

Use	Daily Exposure	(mg/kg/day) Inhalation	Annual Exposure	<pre>(mg/kg/year) Inhalation</pre>
Homeowner Greenhouse	0.17	(a)	2.6	(a)
(Ornamental) Residential PCO Commercial PCO Tobacco-Foliar Tobacco-Transplant Turf grass	0.34 0.41 0.13 0.023 0.047 0.83	(a) (a) 0.002 3.0 x 10-4 5.9 x 10-4 9.1 x 10-4	16 91 29 0.070 0.047	(a) (a) 0.48 9.0 x 10 ⁻⁴ 5.9 x 10 ⁻⁴ 0.015

⁽a) Below the limit of detection

The above estimates assume a 70 kg individual and are not adjusted for dermal and inhalation absorption of acephate.

Postapplication monitoring of acephate in the greenhouse and indoor sites indicated that residues were low or nondetectable. Postapplication air levels of acephate will depend to a large degree on the air exchange rate in the greenhouse. Home air levels of acephate 4 hours to 4 days after application did not exceed 0.008 ug/l based on the detection limit. The highest air levels of acephate in a commercial site occurred 4 hours after application and was 0.015 ug/l. Based on an 8-hour work day, the postapplication inhalation exposure to individuals at the work site would be 3.0 ug/kg/day on the day of treatment.

Curt Lunchick, Chemist

Special Review Section #2

Exposure Assessment Branch/HED (TS-769C)